



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 30, 2004

Ms. Cynthia Villareal-Reyna
Section Chief
Legal and Compliance Division
Texas Department of Insurance
P.O. Box 149104
Austin, Texas 78714

OR2004-8325

Dear Ms. Villarreal-Reyna:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 210059.

The Texas Department of Insurance (the "department") received two requests for information pertaining to a named insurance agent. You claim that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.111, and 552.136 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

As a preliminary matter, we note that a portion of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides in relevant part:

the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

¹ We note that in your letter dated August 3, 2004, you have withdrawn your assertions under sections 552.103, 552.107, 552.130, and 552.137 of the Government Code.

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The information you have submitted includes a completed "Investigative Report." Thus, the department must release this information pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless the information is confidential under other law or is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. While you contend that the submitted information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code, we note that section 552.111 is a discretionary exception that protects the governmental body's interests and is therefore not other law that makes information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022. *See* Open Records Decision No. 473 (1987) (governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.111); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Thus, the department may not withhold any of the information that is encompassed by section 552.022 under section 552.111 of the Government Code. You claim that the "Investigative Report" is protected under the attorney work product privilege, which is found in Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. The Texas Supreme Court held that "[t]he Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and Texas Rules of Evidence are 'other law' within the meaning of section 552.022." *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 337 (Tex. 2001). Thus, we will determine whether this information is confidential under Rule 192.5.

For the purpose of section 552.022(a), information is confidential under Rule 192.5 only to the extent the information implicates the core work product aspect of the work product privilege. Open Records Decision No. 677 at 9-10 (2002). Core work product is defined as the work product of an attorney or an attorney's representative developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial that contains the attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(a), (b)(1). Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney core work product from disclosure under Rule 192.5, a governmental body must demonstrate that the material was 1) created for trial or in anticipation of litigation and 2) consists of an attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. *Id.* The first prong of the work product test, which requires a governmental body to show that the information at issue was created in anticipation of litigation, has two parts. A governmental body must demonstrate that 1) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue, and 2) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and conducted the investigation for the purpose of preparing for such litigation. *See Nat'l Tank v. Brotherton*, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A "substantial chance" of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather "that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear." *Id.* at 204. The second prong of the work product test requires the governmental body to show that the documents at issue contain the attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental

impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document containing core work product information that meets both prongs of the work product test is confidential under Rule 192.5 provided the information does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in Rule 192.5(c). *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ). Having considered your arguments and representations and having reviewed the information at issue, we conclude that you have established that the “Investigative Report” you have marked was created in anticipation of litigation and contains an attorney’s representative’s mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. We therefore conclude that the marked report may be withheld pursuant to Rule 192.5.

We now address your arguments for the information not subject to section 552.022. You contend that portions of this information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” This section encompasses the doctrine of common law privacy. Common law privacy protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). This office has found that information identifying the enrollees in a particular insurance plan is excepted from public disclosure because such information implicates the common law right of privacy of the enrollee. See, e.g., Open Records Decision No. 600 at 9-12 (personal financial choices concerning insurance are generally confidential). Thus, we agree that the department must withhold most of the identifying information of the enrollees that you have marked, in addition to the information we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common law privacy. We have marked a small portion of information that is not identifying and must be released.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from required public disclosure “an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. See Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. See *Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined that section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the

governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 5. A governmental body's policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. The Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body's policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body's policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995). Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

You inform us that the intra-agency memorandum at issue addresses "the handling of regulatory matters, recommended actions, and opinions and analyses or regulatory matters." Upon review, we find that the opinion portions of the memorandum, which we have marked, may be withheld pursuant to section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Next, we address your claims under section 552.136 for the remaining submitted information. This section provides in relevant part:

(a) In this section, "access device" means a card, plate, code, account number, personal identification number, electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other telecommunications service, equipment, or instrument identifier or means of account access that alone or in conjunction with another access device may be used to:

- (1) obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value; or
- (2) initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.

Gov't Code § 552.136. The insurance account numbers, certificate policy numbers, and bank account numbers you have marked, in addition to the information we have marked, are excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.136.

Finally, section 552.137 excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See* Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee’s work e-mail address because such an address is not that of the employee as a “member of the public” but is instead the address of the individual as a government employee. The e-mail address at issue does not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). We have marked the e-mail address that the department must withhold under section 552.137 unless the owner has affirmatively consented to its release.

In summary, the section 552.022(a)(1) information we have marked may be withheld under Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. You must withhold the marked identifying information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common law privacy. The department may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111. The marked insurance account numbers, certificate policy numbers, and bank account numbers must be withheld under section 552.136. Unless the department has received affirmative consent to release the marked e-mail address, the department must withhold it pursuant to section 552.137. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov’t Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body’s intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor

should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Debbie K. Lee
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DKL/seg

Ref: ID# 210059

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Sandy Byrd
Mid-America Estate Services, LLC
15603 Kuykendahl, Suite 150
Houston, Texas 77090
(w/o enclosures)